

## **PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE**

**DATE:** August 13, 2009

**CALLED TO ORDER:** 5:01 p.m.

**ADJOURNED:** 6:48 p.m.

### **ATTENDANCE**

#### **Attending Members**

Susie Day, Chairwoman  
Vernon Brown  
Monroe Gray  
Janice McHenry  
Mike McQuillen  
William Oliver  
Mike Speedy

#### **Absent Members**

### **AGENDA**

PROPOSAL NO. 293, 2009 - directs the Director and the Board of Parks and Recreation to consider the sale of city golf courses  
"Tabled" Vote: 7-0

### **BUDGET HEARING**

Department of Parks and Recreation

## **PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE**

The Parks and Recreation Committee of the City-County Council met on Thursday, August 13, 2009. Chairwoman Susie Day called the meeting to order at 5:01 p.m. with the following members present: Monroe Gray, Janice McHenry, Mike McQuillen, William Oliver, and Mike Speedy. Vernon Brown arrived shortly thereafter. Councillor Ed Coleman and Council Chief Financial Officer, James Steele, were also in attendance.

Chairwoman Day asked each Committee member to introduce themselves and indicate which portion of the County they represent.

{Clerk's Note: Councillor Brown arrived at 5:03 p.m.}

PROPOSAL NO. 293, 2009 - directs the Director and the Board of Parks and Recreation to consider the sale of city golf courses

Councillor Coleman said that after talking to many people, he has concluded that there are certain things in which the city does not need to be involved. He submitted this proposal, therefore, for the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) to do a study to determine how much each golf course in the city is gaining or losing in revenue, what each golf course is spending, and how much each property would be worth if it was sold. The proposal would give DPR until February 1, 2010 to have this study completed.

Councillor Brown said that some of this information is already available through studies done within the past three years.

Councillor Speedy said he appreciates the basic concept of this proposal, but the decision was made long ago to introduce private management of golf courses, and it has been a great benefit to the city thus far. He said it has been a supplement in the budget each year, because of the success of private management. Councillor Speedy said that the city has already captured the benefit of what Councillor Coleman is trying to do, while maintaining greenspace on public lands. He said in addition to the information already available, the city is at the bottom of an economic cycle, and right now the value of the assets are probably at their lowest point. He said because of these concerns, he would like to see this proposal tabled and reconsidered at a later time.

Councillor Coleman said he does not think the numbers that Councillor Speedy is speaking of include the value of the property from a real estate aspect, or how much the property would be valued at if it were sold. He said he is asking for a feasibility study; he is not asking to sell off the golf courses. He said he does not know why anyone would be afraid to see the numbers as they are.

Councillor Gray asked Councillor Coleman how he suggests that the city pay for the feasibility study, considering financial constraints. Councillor Coleman said it is his understanding that the numbers are already available, and the Council's Vice-President informed him that DPR was going to use a real estate agent to price the City's Parks land. Therefore, since a company is already retained, he feels DPR could use them to assess the golf courses as well.

Councillor Brown said he understands what Councillor Coleman is trying to do, but right now the bidding process is already underway. Therefore, this information will not be helpful. He said that when the property is up for bid in five or ten years, the assessed value may be totally different.

Councillor Speedy moved, seconded by Councillor McQuillen, to "Table" Proposal No. 293, 2009. The motion carried by a vote of 7-0.

### **BUDGET HEARING**

#### **Budget Overview**

David Reynolds, City Controller, reviewed the budget handout, attached as Exhibit A. He said that it is important to have a balanced budget. Mr. Reynolds said he obtained a five-year financial plan when he took his position in January of 2008 that was completed by the previous administration, and it was based on 2007 data. He said that in 2007, the fund balance was projected to be in the negative in two years. Mr. Reynolds said that he asked each agency not to spend 5% of their annual budget, so that they could have it for the fund balance. He said the 2009 budget also started at the 95% spending level, and the 2010 budget moves the fund balance closer to the recommended balance. Mr. Reynolds said that in 2011 and 2012, there will still be some constraints and revenues to offset, but the fund balance will be moving in the right direction. He said these are daily decisions that are being made throughout City and County government.

Mr. Reynolds reviewed the details of the 2010 Budget. He said that it is balanced and is a simple calculation of revenue versus spending, with a slight adjustment for fee-supported programs. The fee-supported programs are Stormwater and Sanitation, and sometimes the fees generate more revenue than what is being spent, and that produces a surplus. Some years there is more spending than revenue, which results in a deficit. He said the overall budget revenues are \$1.234 billion, and the appropriations are \$1,222 billion. He said that \$11.6 million in fees is subtracted out, which leaves a surplus, or fund balance, of \$400,000. Mr. Reynolds said that it is not much, but it is a surplus, and therefore, this is a balanced budget.

Councillor Gray asked how much of the \$1.234 billion is from golf revenue. Mr. Reynolds said \$1 million is the estimated golf revenue. Councillor Gray asked if

that was the \$1 million that the Controller's Office has been holding. Mr. Reynolds said they not only need to make sure that the budget is balanced, but they also have to consider the individual funds. DPR is run out of the Parks General Fund, and the General Fund has a negative fund balance. There is a Golf sub-fund that is part of the same fund, and is basically loaning funds to the Parks General Sub-Fund so that they can continue to operate. Mr. Reynolds said that he is holding those funds so that the overall fund stays in a positive position and Parks can continue to operate.

Mr. Reynolds said as they discussed the Parks budget, part of his goal was to get the Parks General Sub-Fund back into a positive position. He said right now, they are projecting the Parks General Sub-Fund to be in the negative by \$3.1 million at the end of 2009. He said the proposed 2010 budget is not being driven to balance the overall budget, but to return the Parks General Sub-Fund to a positive position. He said they are attempting to work with DPR to make sure that they are spending within their means. Even with deductions, the Parks General Sub-Fund is still going to end in an negative position, and he will still have to hold some golf money in order to keep the overall fund from going negative.

Mr. Reynolds referred to the graph representing 2010 projected revenues. He said that the 2010 budget is the first year that the full effect of the property tax circuit breaker will be felt. He said they are projecting that \$30 million in revenue will be lost. He said that when he refers to the circuit breaker he is referring to the fact that on a residential homestead property, property taxes cannot be greater than 1% of the assessed value; on other residential properties, taxes cannot be more than 2% of the assessed value; and on commercial property, taxes cannot be more than 3% of the assessed value. He said this 2010 proposed budget also suggests continuing the property tax levy freeze that was started in 2007. When the rate for the income tax increased, part of that rate froze property tax levies, and they recommend continuing this freeze for one more year. Mr. Reynolds said they are able to put \$16 million into the County's Rainy Day Fund from the revenues this year. He said this money may be needed as the fund balances go down in future years. He added that the budget also includes \$60 million of federal stimulus money.

Mr. Reynolds said that the \$60 million in stimulus money does not impact the condition of the fund balance, or whether or not the budget is balanced. All of that \$60 million in stimulus money comes in as revenue and is budgeted to be spent within the same year. If the stimulus money was extracted from the program, it would not change the budget chart. Mr. Reynolds said the stimulus money is going to projects that would have otherwise been delayed, with one exception for the federal COPS grant program that includes hiring 50 additional police officers. He said that this is a three-year program that is funded through federal stimulus dollars.

Councillor Speedy asked if the stimulus money is included with the \$277.9 million inter-government funds. Mr. Reynolds answered in the affirmative.

Councillor Oliver asked if any of the stimulus funds will go to DPR. Stuart Lowry, Director, DPR, said at this point none of the stimulus funds are going toward DPR projects. He said they have partnered with the Office of Sustainability and have put in a significant grant request in the amount of \$600,000 for energy efficiency. Mr. Lowry said it has a strong possibility of being approved and will allow DPR to do some energy efficiency changes within the Parks system to reduce their utility costs.

Councillor Oliver asked if these would be additional funds. Mr. Lowry answered in the affirmative. He said this is a similar situation to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century grant that was not in the budget last year. He said the \$600,000 grant request is not included in this budget because they do not have a guarantee that this grant will come through, but that is the strongest area within the stimulus guidelines where they feel they might be granted a request.

Mr. Reynolds said that total appropriations increased 2.5%. Public Safety makes up 35% of the budget, with an 8.6% increase; Criminal Justice is 17% of the budget, with a 4.2% increase; and debt service increases \$14 million related to pension debt and final welfare payments for the Family and Children's Fund. The balanced budget includes:

- Salary increases for the lowest paid employees
- Federal COPS funding for 50 additional officers
- Crime Prevention Grants
- \$22 million more in infrastructure improvements
- Funding for the 1<sup>st</sup> phase of the integrated financial management system
- Perry Township Fire Department Consolidation
- Previously Negotiated Union Contracts
- Consolidation of the Township Assessor Offices saving \$2 million

Mr. Reynolds said there are approximately 300 employees at the lowest end of the salary schedule that are being paid below the federal poverty level, and this budget raises the salary schedule of the lowest nine grades bringing them above that level. Mr. Reynolds said the budget provides funding for the first phase of the Integrated Financial Management System to consolidate operations of the City and County's finances. The budget also includes \$1 million in Arts grant funding.

Councillor Brown asked if the infrastructure improvements are a result of the stimulus money. Mr. Reynolds answered in the affirmative. Councillor Brown asked if the Prosecutor's Office will ever be consolidated with the city's hiring and

personnel department. He said that he understands the Prosecutor's Office does not adhere to the residency requirements to which the rest of the city has to comply. Mr. Reynolds said that as of January, there were six different human resources departments within the city and county enterprise. He said that he hired Bruce Henry from the Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department's (IMPD) Human Resources (HR) department to run the City and County Human Resources Department. Since that time, the HR departments of IMPD and the Indianapolis Fire Department (IFD) have been consolidated into the City-County HR department, and there are still a few outstanding HR departments, namely the Prosecutor's Office, the Sheriff's Department and the Courts. He said that he continues to negotiate that consolidation.

### **Department of Parks and Recreation**

Stuart Lowry, Director, Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), said that when he took over the Parks budget in 2008, they had to deal with a strong deficit, and it is a tough climate to make up that deficit. He said that they have heavily relied on donations from foundations in the past, but in these hard economic times, donations are not as easily obtained. He added that with the property tax caps, they are also seeing a loss of revenue in that area. He said that these issues affect their deferred maintenance program, and they are working to partner with other departments to use some of their stimulus dollars to help in some of these situations. Mr. Lowry showed a brief Powerpoint presentation, which is attached as Exhibit B. He showed before and after photos of the renovations and upgrades to football fields, aquatic facilities, and community centers, which were achieved partly through partnerships. He said that partnerships are vital in helping fund programs like the Barton Park Ivy Tech Outdoor Education Initiative and Rupert's Kids. Mr. Lowry added that 80% of DPR's playgrounds needed to be replaced. The Parks Department is now certified to produce FIBAR, a certified playground surface material, which is a mulch material that is re-ground and is safe to put under playground equipment. He said that DPR uses wood waste or trees removed from parks property to make the FIBAR to resurface playgrounds, which results in an \$80,000 annual savings. He said that they have also partnered with Eli Lilly and Home Depot for work days at the parks to help maintain and beautify parks property.

Councillor Speedy asked how long they have been resurfacing the playgrounds with recycled materials. Mr. Lowry stated that the playground surface needs to be replaced every two years, and in the past they have had to purchase FIBAR. This, however, is the first year they have been able to produce their own FIBAR to resurface 20 playgrounds and save approximately \$80,000. He said that the product is different than just plain mulch.

Councillor McHenry asked if DPR is able to use fallen branches from storms to make the FIBAR. Mr. Lowry said that they can use any wood waste product and certainly look for that type of resource to use free of charge.

Mr. Lowry said that the request for proposals (RFPs) for golf course operations are due tomorrow, Friday, August 14, 2009. He added that \$5.7 million in deferred capital expenditures and maintenance are part of that RFP process and will become the responsibility of the operators, resulting in savings for DPR. Mr. Lowry said that based on the tax reduction, DPR needs to address a \$2.3 million adjustment. One of the things that has been driving up DPR's deficit is that they were not paying their utility costs in the year that they occurred and were carrying those costs over into the next year, which put them further in debt. Paying off those utilities within the same fiscal year will result in savings, and will allow them to go into 2010 with all 2009 utilities paid, which will result in approximately \$200,000 worth of savings.

Councillor Oliver referred to the parks utilities slide and said that it seems stimulus dollars are being used by Parks even though Controller Reynolds testified differently. Mr. Lowry said that DPR has not received any stimulus dollars, but the Office of Sustainability has requested a stimulus grant related to energy efficiency, and they are requesting a portion of those grant dollars to help implement energy saving processes throughout parks. They have not yet heard whether they will receive these dollars, however, so that money is not included in the current proposed budget.

Mr. Lowry said that another area where they have found some savings is in working with the Information Services Agency (ISA) to reduce their internal charges from \$1.6 million to just over \$1 million, without affecting technology support in the department. He said they are also looking at ways to have cost efficiency and best practices through a competitive bid process, specifically in their maintenance areas. He said they hope to find some significant savings through that process.

Councillor Gray asked what services they are looking at for the competitive bid process. Mr. Lowry said that they are looking at services such as mowing, plumbing, HVAC (heating, ventilating and air conditioning), and athletic field turf maintenance. He said that they already do some competitive services, and increasing that area might help to produce more revenue to address the deficit.

Councillor Brown said that the second page of the budget summary indicates that DPR has decreased their annual budget by approximately 15.8% in the last three years. He said that it looks like that \$15 decrease has happened in just this one year. Angela Daniel, Chief Financial Officer (CFO) for DPR, said that the 2009 projected spending includes a one-time infusion of \$3.9 million to fix the pools. She said if that amount is taken out of the 2009 year-end projected balance, then

the new balance would be \$29.4 million. She added that comparing that to the \$27.1 million projected 2010 budget produces the shortfall of \$2.3 million to which Director Lowry has been referring throughout his presentation. Councillor Brown said that even ignoring that one-time infusion, the 2008 budget was \$32.2 million, which means in just two years, the budget has been cut \$5 million. Mr. Lowry said that he was not serving as Director in 2008, so the \$2.3 million shortfall is all that he can speak to, but they have made some significant progress in reducing the debt and deficit they had when he took office. He said that they are trying to both rectify the debt that they inherited and address the new revenue shortfall created by the property tax caps.

Councillor Brown referred to the one-third reduction in ISA charges for 2010, and asked if ISA charges are decreasing for all departments in 2010. Mr. Reynolds said that ISA looked at all of their costs in 2009 and broke it down by technology stats, and instead of charging per headcount, they changed their chargeback process. He said that the amount of money ISA is getting across the board from all the agencies has stayed the same for the last three years, and is not increasing in 2010. By Parks paying less, it means another agency is paying more, as is the case with the Office of Finance and Management.

Councillor Brown asked if the reduction in Character 01 is due to a reduction in staff. Mr. Lowry said that this is possible due to the competitive bid process, and how many full time equivalents (FTEs) are employed for each project. He said that there is also some fluctuation in seasonal personnel based on the amount of time pools or other venues are open. Councillor Brown asked if any employees are receiving raises in 2010. Mr. Lowry said that outside of union personnel, whose salaries are covered by contracts, there are no additional raises included, unless some of those positions are one of those pay grades to be raised above the poverty level. Mr. Lowry added that they are still looking at new revenue ideas, such as sponsorships, but they are not included in this budget because they have not yet come to fruition. He said that if they are able to bring in new revenue through other ways, some of these reductions may not have to occur.

Councillor Brown asked about equipment and maintenance repair, line item 362. Ms. Daniel stated that money is budgeted in line item 338, and then when the expenses occur, they are charged to the specific line item, and therefore, Councillor Brown needs to look at line item 362 in conjunction with line item 338. Councillor Brown asked about line item 377. Ms. Daniel said that this is due to some legal settlements they are back-paying to the Office of Corporation Counsel, who covered those costs. Mr. Lowry said that a couple of those are large settlements and are from quite a few years ago. Councillor Brown referred to line item 410 and the \$2 million reduction. Ms. Daniel said that most of that is due to the one-time infusion for the repair of the pools.

Councillor Speedy asked what the nature of the legal settlements were. Mr. Lowry said that he believes a couple were related to playground areas, one to a field area, and one related to a tree at Holiday Park. Often these types of cases take a long time to settle. Councillor Speedy asked if they have officially been settled. Mr. Lowry said that they have, and that is how they knew how much to budget. He said he can provide more information at the next meeting if the committee so wishes. Councillor Speedy asked if these are handled by a third party or through the Office of Corporation Counsel (OCC). Mr. Lowry said that they hear about them through OCC, but he is not sure if they are sub-contracted out. He said he will bring more information to the next meeting.

Councillor Brown referred to item 738002, and asked about the fluctuation. Ms. Daniel said that this is something she uncovered today and believes they will need to come back to the committee with an amendment. She said that she needs to research this, as she is not sure why it is in the report when it does not show in the system. Councillor Brown referred to item 768003 and asked if they are making money in commercial rentals. Ms. Daniel said that this increase is due to a second vendor wanting to be hooked up to a cell tower at Sahn Park, some possibilities with Riverside Marina, possible parking at Bush Stadium, increased revenue at Eagle Creek Park from Rick's Boatyard, the Sailing Club and Bait Shop, and some facilities on the Monon Trail. Councillor Brown said that these are anticipated but are not secure, and asked what alternatives they have if they do not occur. Mr. Lowry said that they have only included the ones of which they have the strongest feeling they will occur and are already involved in negotiations.

Councillor Gray asked about the increased revenue from Rick's Boatyard. Paul Smith, Real Estate Manager, DPR, said that the original lease with Rick's Boatyard called for a rent increase in years seven and fifteen. An increase did not occur in year seven, which he cannot account for, and this is year fifteen, which will see a significant increase to make up for that oversight. Ms. Daniel said that they tried very hard to err on the side of caution and be conservative with their numbers.

Councillor Brown asked about the totals under fees for services for Character 777 and why there is such a difference. Ms. Daniel said that they can bring a more detailed breakdown of this Character to the next meeting.

Councillor Speedy asked about gate admissions. Ms. Daniel said that the fluctuation is due to admissions being rolled into one item and then once revenues come in, they are credited to the proper line item, such as with dog park admissions. Ms. Daniel added that a lot of the discrepancy in this character is due to golf revenues. She said that with the new RFPs and the operators being responsible for some of the capital expenditures, they anticipate receiving less golf revenue, and the budget was adjusted for that. Councillor Brown asked

if the overall gate admission revenues are down due to the economic climate. Ms. Daniel said that she will need to look at that more closely before providing an answer. Mr. Reynolds commended Mr. Lowry and the department for being more conservative in their revenue projections. He said that part of the reason for past deficits was due to setting revenue projections too high, not meeting them, and then ending up with negative fund balances. He commended Mr. Lowry and Ms. Daniel for taking steps to bring that number down to a more realistic amount.

Councillor Brown said that most of the benchmarks provided relate to facilities and amenities, and he would like to see some numbers on the amount of people impacted by Parks and Parks programs.

Councillor Oliver said that he hopes there are sufficient funds in the budget for mowing. He said many areas are in violation of the high weeds ordinance. He said that some areas are not being mowed and instead, signs are being put up to designate these high weeds as a habitat for the Monarch butterfly and hummingbird. He said that these species are not on any protected lists, and designating these areas as a means to cut back on the cost of mowing is a disservice to taxpayers. He said that the excuse that the city is cutting down on emissions of pollutants in the air has also been used to explain unmowed areas. He asked if this is going to be a trend. He is disappointed that they are taking away areas that could be enjoyed and used by its citizens just to save a little money. Mr. Lowry said that there was significant rain at the beginning of the year, and the contracts were being redone at that time, and this caused mowing to fall behind. He said they are looking at prairie restoration areas and can provide a presentation about areas throughout the parks system with biospheres and the purpose for them.

Councillor Brown asked if Mr. Lowry can provide some information at the next meeting regarding labor relations and privatization of some functions. He said that he would like to see raises for a very deserving staff. Mr. Lowry agreed and said that with a \$2.3 million shortfall, it is hard to find funds for increases.

Councillor Oliver said that he was told that park property would be mowed once a week from April to July and twice a week from July through the rest of the year. He asked if this is the correct practice. Ron Banks, administrator of the mowing contracts, stated that the parks are normally cut once a week through the first of July, and then cut every other week following that during the growing season. Due to lots of rain, they had to increase the number of cuts. So far the cutting has not slowed down, as it usually does beginning in July. Councillor Oliver said that certain parks were not cut in July, certainly not Washington Park, and he asked what the checks and balances are for insuring parks get cut. Mr. Banks said that each mowing contractor has a compliance form they have to submit on the days they mow. Within 24 hours of receiving that form, Parks personnel

inspect that the mowing has met Parks' standards. If it is rejected, the contractor has 24 hours to correct whatever problem was identified before approval is sent. Without Parks' approval, the contractor cannot submit their invoice to be paid. Councillor Oliver asked if there is money in the budget for 20 cuts. Mr. Lowry said that contractors have a new two-year contract, and depending on the weather, it should run very smoothly. Councillor Oliver said that he would like a list of parks and the mowing cycles.

Chairwoman Day called for public testimony at 6:26 p.m.

Shane Brinkman, president of American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) Local 1887, stated that the weekly employees line item is for union employees and shows a reduction of \$866,913. He said that this is a 29% reduction. He said that even with the transfer of four forestry division personnel, there is no way the Parks Department could have this size of reduction simply through the competitive process. He said that there are two HVAC people and four plumbers employed by Parks. If those individuals were not used and an outside vendor was used, the prices would not be even close to competitive. He said that they cannot get this type of savings without a layoff situation. He said that even taking money from long-term employees, there would still not be enough money to contract out the jobs.

Councillor Speedy asked how long the competitive bid contracts endure. Mr. Lowry said that it depends on the contract. He said that mowing contracts are two-year contracts. He said that they do not know until bids are received whether contracts will be let on services. Councillor Speedy asked if until the bids are received and it is determined there will be savings, there is no commitment to accept the bids. Mr. Lowry said that this is correct.

Councillor Brown said that it was testified that the only employees in Parks receiving raises were union personnel, but now Mr. Brinkman brings to attention the fact that 29% of those positions will be eliminated. He asked Mr. Lowry to provide more information regarding this decrease at the next meeting, including how many employees might be displaced.

[Clerk's Note: Councillor McQuillen left at 6:34 p.m.]

Pat Andrews, vice-president of the Marion County Alliance of Neighborhood Associations (MCANA), said that in looking at the budget, Character 01 seems much lighter, and she is concerned about these cuts. She said that Indianapolis is lucky to have Mr. Reynolds as City Controller, and she agrees that it is important to have a healthy balanced budget for the future of the city. However, within that budget, there are choices that can be made, and that is the reason for the public dialogue. She said that in looking at the whole budget, the tax revenue coming into the city increases by \$26 or \$27 million even after the tax caps. She

said that income tax is what is driving up the net revenue for the city, but Parks is funded by the Park General Fund, which is funded by property taxes, and they are being asked to take a bigger hit in budget reductions. Asking Parks to take a bigger hit does not recognize the role they play in making Indianapolis a great place to live. She said that there are other options to consider, such as in 2007, when some funds were transferred into Parks from the Consolidated County Fund. She asked why they cannot supplement the hit of reduced property tax with a transfer just this one year. She said that the Controller is proposing putting \$16 million into the Rainy Day Fund. This gives the city wiggle room to maybe give Parks \$1 million to help with their shortfall and still have \$15 million to deposit into the Rainy Day Fund.

Mr. Reynolds said that the budget process is all about making choices, and that is why it is an open public debate. The circuit breaker is causing an overall loss of revenue of \$30 million in the city and county budget, not just the \$2.3 million affecting Parks. He said that this is an ongoing issue, and they have lost that revenue, and it is never coming back. He said that transferring money into the department from another area may solve that issue for one year, but the next year, they will be faced with the issue all over again.

Ms. Andrews said that even with tax caps, the assessed levies should continue to rise and revenues should continue to grow. Nonetheless, Parks are the heart and soul of a community. She said that she is not arguing against more money for public safety, but there is more to a city than the number of police officers on a street. Parks helps the city's youth not just to survive in the city, but to actually live.

Councillor Gray asked if the Controller would be willing to give up a million dollars from the Rainy Day Fund. Mr. Reynolds said that to the extent that they add spending in any agency in excess of where the budget is now, with the revenues that have been identified, and that spending is over \$400,000, then they have put the budget out of balance. He said that he believes it is critical to maintain that balance. He said that instead of taking money from savings and putting the budget out of balance, maybe some tough choices need to be made about where else money can be saved or cut to reallocate dollars to Parks if the committee and community feel it is more important.

Councillor Oliver asked about the overtime elimination. Mr Reynolds said that one of the final cuts made to the budget was to cut all overtime requests across the budget, with the exception of the Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department, the Indianapolis Fire Department, the Metropolitan Emergency Communications Agency (MECA) dispatchers, and the Department of Public Works. He said that even the Council's overtime budget was eliminated. Councillor Oliver said that cutting back on manpower and man hours will cause service to suffer. Mr. Lowry said that their goal is not to cut service, but to make

the service more efficient. Councillor Oliver said cutting manpower in half does not necessarily make service more efficient in practicality, but instead could increase workmen's compensation, injuries and the possibility of lawsuits.

Councillor Brown said that Parks is about people, and if Mr. Reynolds is not comfortable taking money from the Rainy Day Fund, maybe he can come to the next meeting and identify areas from where the money can come. Mr. Reynolds said that it is his position that the budget introduced funds Parks at a level he feels is adequate.

There being no further business, and upon motion duly made, the meeting was adjourned at 6:48 p.m.

Respectfully admitted,

---

Susie Day, Chair  
Parks and Recreation Committee

SD/ag